

REMARKS

This Reply is submitted to correct an inadvertent error in a statement made in Applicants' previous Supplemental Reply of January 24, 2005. Specifically, at page 17, starting at line 6 of the January 24th Reply, Applicants stated:

Applicants also submit that Rinehart '579 represents the closest prior art example. With regard to examples from any of the other cited references of Matthews '862, Abdou-Sabet '628, Sezaki '692 and Ottawa '785, each of these references does not define a trade name of paraffinic oil. Therefore, Applicants cannot submit any data regarding the paraffinic oils described in Matthews '862, Abdou-Sabet '628, Sezaki '692 or Ottawa '785.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Ottawa '785 discloses Example 12, which uses a process oil produced by Idemitsu Kosan Co. with the trade name of PW 380. Thus, Applicants respectfully apologize, and submit this statement was made in error.

With respect to Example 12 of Ottawa '785, the disclosed process oil (PW 380) is compounded in the oil-extended rubber (A-1) as used in Example 5 of the present application (see page 38, lines 2-3 from the bottom). The properties are indicated in the Table below. The properties of PW 380 are also explained in Applicants' replies dated June 21, 2004 and January 10, 2005.

TABLE

		PW 380
kinetic viscosity	(cSt)	382
viscosity index		110
flash point	(°C)	300
pour point	(°C)	-15
density	(g/m ³)	0.877
molecular weight		746
evaporation loss	(%)	0.05

As can be seen from the above Table, PW 380 does not meet the instantly claimed requirements of "a kinetic viscosity (40°C) of 50 to 250 cSt". Further, the paraffinic oil having a kinetic viscosity (40°C) of more than 250 cSt is inferior in handling. Thus, Applicants maintain their position that the rejections in view of Ottawa '785 have been overcome.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Eugene T. Perez (Reg. No. 48,501) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

. Application No. 09/779,558

Art Unit 1713


Supplemental Reply

A full and complete response has been made to all issues as cited in the Office Action with Applicants' previous Reply filed on January 10, 2005. Thus, it is believed that no payments for further extensions of time are needed.

Still, if necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Marc S. Weiner, #32,181

MSW/ETP
1254-0170P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000